1	2	3	4
24.	Sikkim*		
25.	Tamil Nadu	37	2852.8
26.	Tripura	5	109.5
27.	Uttaranchal	20	
28.	Uttar Pradesh	83	2007.9
29.	West Bengal	75	3350.0
30.	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	1	8.6
31.	Chandigarh	2	59.9
32.	D & N Haveli	1	1.2
33.	Daman & Diu	2	3.5
34.	Lakshadweep	1	1.7
35.	Pondicherry	1	90.6
	TOTAL	937	27789.0

Note:-'No Employment Exchange is functioning in this State.

Closure of CPSUs

1307. SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Will the Minister of LABOUR be pleased to state:

(a) whether closure in being permitted to CPSUs like RIC, BPMEL, TAFCO etc. under the Industrial Disputes Act;

(b) if so, whether to same is done without the concurrence of the State Governments;

(c) if so, the reasons therefor when labour is concurrent subject and law and order arising out of closures is to be handled l>y the State Governments;

(d) whether the State Government is appropriate authority on labour matters within the State under the Industrial Disputes Act;

(e) if so, whether closure is not a labour matter; and

(f) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR (SHRI MUNI LALL): (a) to (f) The appropriate Government for giving permission for closure of industrial establishments, including Central Public Sector Undertakings (CPSUs), is clearly defined in the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In accordance with these provisions, the Central Government accorded permission for closure to RIC, BPMEL, & TAFCO after following the due procedure laid down in the I.D. Act. The concurrence of the State Governments was not required for this. The State Government is the appropriate authority on labour matters duly prescribed under the ID Act and can accord permission for closure of industrial establishments falling in the State sphere.

Ratification of ILO convention on Social Security Standards

1308. SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Will the Minister of LABOUR be pleased to state:

(a) whether the working Group on Labour Policy for the Ninth Five Year Plan (1997—2002) had recommended that the ILO convention on Social Security (Minimum) Standards, 1952 should be examined and efforts be made to ratify the same during the Ninth Five Year Plan period;

(b) if so, whether Government would ratify the ILO Convention No. 102 of 1952 before the end of the Ninth Five Year Plan; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR (SHRI MUNI LALL):(a) Yes, Sir. The Working Group on Labour Policy for the Ninth Five Year Plan (1997—2002) had recommended that the ILO Convention No. 102 concerning Social Security (Minimum) Standards, 1952 should be examined and efforts be made to ratify the same during the 9th Five Year Plan.

(b) and (c) The question of ratification of the ILO Convention No. 102 has been examined by the Government from time to time. In India, at present there is no comprehensive social security against unemployment. However, other social security measures as envisaged by the ILO Convention No. 102 are by and large met under the